UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/697,183	10/27/2000	Tadashi Ohashi	1341.1087 (JDH)	4450

21171 7590 03/02/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/697,183	OHASHI, TADASHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin R Bruckart	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 December 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-16 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,151,708 by Pedrizetti et al in view of Perkowski.

Regarding claim 1, a service processor control system (Pedrizetti: col. 1, lines 28-31; col. 2, lines 25-37) comprising:

a component information storage server storing component information on all of hardware and firmware constituting a product (Pedrizetti: col. 1, lines 41-45), control information for controlling at least a hardware state of a host and setting information for setting the hardware state (Pedrizetti: col. 1, lines 45-55), and connected to the Internet (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 60-65); and

a client connected to a service processor connected to said host and said Internet (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 60-65), having at least a maintenance service function (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 55-65; col. 3, lines 42-56; Figures 6A-6G), as a console function for said service processor

(Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 55-65; col. 3, lines 42-56; Figures 6A-6G), based on said control information and said setting information, and drawing said component information, said control information and said setting information through a browser (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 60-65)

wherein the client receives the component information from the component information storage server (Pedrizetti: col. 3, lines 42-67),

The Pedrizetti reference does not explicitly state component information including at least one text manual.

The Perkowski reference teaches component information including at least one text manual and a diagram of the product having a new design notice (Perkowski: col. 5, lines 10-25; col. 18, lines 1-7), and

wherein the client displays the text manual and the diagram in a human-readable manner on the browser (Perkowski: col. 6, lines 25-29).

The Perkowski reference further teaches the invention offers 24-hour availability with accurate, up-to-date product information (Perkowski: col. 1, lines 62-67).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create a service processor control system as taught by Pedrizetti while employing an online as taught by Perkowski in order to provide up-to-date, 24-hour available information.

Claims 2-9 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Pedrizetti et al and Perkowski.

Regarding claim 2, the service processor control system according to claim 1, wherein said client executes control relating to said service processor through said browser (Pedrizetti: col. 4, lines 38-42), thereby setting and controlling the hardware state of said host based on said control information and said setting information (Pedrizetti: col. 1, lines 56-62).

Regarding claim 3, the service processor control system according to claim 1, wherein said component information, said control information and said setting information are described in XML and said browser is made to correspond to said XML (Pedrizetti: col. 10, lines 26-34).

Regarding claim 4, the service processor control system according to claim 1, wherein another client connected to said Internet is provided with said browser (Pedrizetti: col. 9, lines 30-36; Figure 7).

Regarding claim 5, the service processor control system according to claim 1, wherein said client executes control over information on said service processor using the XML including a tag for defining a type of information on the hardware of said host by DTD (Pedrizetti: col. 10, lines 26-40; tags define content).

Regarding claim 6, the service processor control system according to claim 5, wherein said client displays said hardware state by a predetermined type of information by using said DTD and DSSSL (Pedrizetti: col. 10, lines 15-40; the DSSSL is a standard for particular formatting like the CDF, line 16).

Regarding claim 7, the service processor control system according to claim 6, wherein said client writes said setting information of a predetermined type into said hardware of said host by using said DTD and DSSSL (Pedrizetti: col. 10, lines 41-53; pull method).

Regarding claim 8, the service processor control system according to claim 6, wherein said client displays a message from said host by scrolling up or down the message by using said DTD or DSSSL (Pedrizetti: col. 10, lines 26-40; how site content is viewed; scrolling is an element of browser markup like HTML, line 19).

Regarding claim 9, the service processor control system according to claim 1, wherein the service processor control system comprises a program server connected to said Internet (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 55-65), storing a program (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 38-46), a loading module for loading said program and control information for controlling execution of said program (Pedrizetti: col. 3, lines 57-67); and

said client extracts said program (Pedrizetti: col. 3, lines 57-67), said loading module and said control information by way of said browser through the Internet and then executes said program (Pedrizetti: col. 4, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 10,

The Pedrizetti reference teaches a computer-readable recording medium recording a service processor control program (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 38-45), connected to a service processor and adapted to a client connected as a console for at least said service processor (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 55-65; col. 3, lines 42-56; Figures 6A-6G), said service processor connected to a component information server storing component information on all hardware and firmware constituting a product (Pedrizetti: Figure 1; database; col. 3, lines 6-18), control information for controlling at least a hardware state of a host and setting information for setting the hardware state through the Internet and connected to said host (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 55-65), wherein

said computer-readable recording medium allows a computer to execute:

extracting said component information, said control information and said setting information through a browser executed by the browser (Pedrizetti: col. 3, lines 57- col. 4, line 11).

The Pedrizetti reference does not explicitly state component information including at least one text manual.

The Perkowski reference teaches component information including at least one text manual and a diagram of the product having a new design notice (Perkowski: col. 5, lines 10-25; col. 18, lines 1-7), and

wherein the client displays the text manual and the diagram in a human-readable manner on the browser (Perkowski: col. 6, lines 25-29).

The Perkowski reference further teaches the invention offers 24-hour availability with accurate, up-to-date product information (Perkowski: col. 1, lines 62-67).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create a service processor control system as taught by Pedrizetti while employing an online as taught by Perkowski in order to provide up-to-date, 24-hour available information.

Claims 11-14 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Pedrizetti et al and Perkowski.

Regarding claim 11, the computer-readable recording medium recording a service processor control program according to claim 10, comprising:

executing control over information on said service processor by using an XML including a tag defining a type of hardware information on said host by DTD (Pedrizetti: col. 3, lines 57-67; col. 10, lines 15-40).

Regarding claim 12, the computer-readable recording medium recording a service processor control program according to claim 10, wherein

said computer-readable recording medium comprises setting and controlling the hardware state of said host based on said control information and said setting information by executing control relating to said service processor through said browser (Pedrizetti: col. 3, lines 42-56).

Regarding claim 13, the computer-readable recording medium recording a service processor control program according to claim 12, comprising:

executing control over information on said service processor by using an XML including a tag defining a type of hardware information on said host by DTD (Pedrizetti: col. 10, lines 26-40).

Regarding claim 14, the service processor according to claim 1, further comprising:

a loading module loading a program to the client and which is automatically executed according to an instruction protocol scanned in at the client (Pedrizetti: col. 3, lines 57-67; pushed and process to the client).

Regarding claim 15, a service processor control system (Pedrizetti: col. 1, lines 28-31; col. 2, lines 25-37) comprising:

a component information storage server storing component information of hardware and firmware relating to a product (Pedrizetti: col. 1, lines 41-45), control information for controlling a hardware state of a host and setting information for setting the hardware state (Pedrizetti: col. 1, lines 45-55), the component information storage server being connected to the Internet (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 60-65); and

a client connected to a service processor connected to the host and to the Internet (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 60-65), performing a maintenance service function including a console function for said service processor (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 55-65; col. 3, lines 42-56; Figures 6A-6G), based on said control information and said setting information through a browser (Pedrizetti: col. 2, lines 55-65; col. 3, lines 42-56; Figures 6A-6G),

wherein the client sends a first set of the component information to the component information storage server (Pedrizetti: col. 3, lines 57-67; col. 4, lines 4-11), and receives a second set of the component information from the storage server (Pedrizetti: col. 4, lines 35-50)

The Pedrizetti reference does not explicitly state component information including at least one text manual.

The Perkowski reference teaches component information including at least one text manual and a diagram of the product having a new design notice (Perkowski: col. 5, lines 10-25; col. 18, lines 1-7), and

wherein the client displays the text manual and the diagram in a human-readable manner on the browser (Perkowski: col. 6, lines 25-29).

The Perkowski reference further teaches the invention offers 24-hour availability with accurate, up-to-date product information (Perkowski: col. 1, lines 62-67).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create a service processor control system as taught by Pedrizetti while employing an online as taught by Perkowski in order to provide up-to-date, 24-hour available information.

Claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Pedrizetti et al and Perkowski.

Regarding claim 16, the service processor control system according to claim 15, wherein the component information is created during a process of manufacturing a product (Pedrizetti: col. 1, lines 13-22; col. 7, lines 46-55; shows how manufacturers can upgrade components on client's computers from configurations).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number 571-272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-3982.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155
brb
2-28-05

BRB

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER